

Lead Entity Advisory Group

October 8, 2004

SeaTac, WA

Summary Notes

LEAG Attendance:	Doug Osterman, Green-Duwamish LE, Chair Steve Martin, Snake River Salmon Recovery Board, Vice Chair Paul Dorn, Kitsap County LE Scott Jungblom, Pend Oreille CD LE Bill Towey, Okanogan County/Colville Tribes LE Kim Bredensteiner, Island County LE John Sims, Quinault Nation LE
Others Present:	Jeanette Dorner, Nisqually Tribe Roy Huberd, Pierce County LE Paul Nelson, Kitsap County LE Jim Fox, IAC/SRFB Rollie Geppert, IAC/SRFB Brian Walsh, WDFW Marnie Tyler, WDFW
LEAG Members Absent:	Amy Hatch-Winecka, Thurston, Mason LE Jeff Breckel, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board
Introduction/ Chair Report	LEAG Chair Doug Osterman opened the meeting and welcomed those in attendance. At the last LEAG meeting, there was a resolution regarding <i>Assessments for Multiple Lead Entities</i> . (The majority voted in favor of recommending to the SRFB that the RFP be deferred until the 6 th funding round.) Doug mentioned that the issue is somewhat academic, as the SRFB has already given its approval. However, there was also a minority position. The Chair has been preparing the minority report and he will send the draft out for further review to Puget Sound Lead Entities. Doug also worked with Steve Martin and WDFW on the agenda for this meeting.
WDFW Report	Brian Walsh provided the WDFW report. Brian provided the LEAG with copies of the work plan matrix that had been developed at the LEAG retreat. Brian mentioned that LEAG has yet to follow-up on the retreat that was held in April. The next step is to develop a workplan for the organization. On a related matter, the LEAG's policies and procedures need to be reviewed and revised per the retreat and decisions made by LEAG at the meeting in Ellensburg in July. He suggested that a group be formed to help with these tasks. Paul Dorn and Doug Osterman volunteered to work with Brian. (Steve Martin's name was also mentioned.)
IAC Report	Jim Fox provided a summary of his testimony at the September 21 House Fisheries, Ecology & Parks Hearing in Olympia. According to Jim, the intended purpose of the meeting was to discuss salmon funding. However, the focus shifted to what folks are doing. Several panels talked about regional recovery

	<p>plans, monitoring, agency coordination, and habitat project funding. Jim observed that many legislators do not know what is going on in their watersheds. It was suggested that Lead Entities could provide valuable outreach through organized field trips with their elected officials. Keep in mind that media events are often a major draw for legislators. TVW videotaped the proceedings of the hearing; for those who are interested, here is the web address for the TVW archives- http://www.tvw.org/</p> <p>Jim also reviewed the agenda for the upcoming SRFB meeting on October 28 and 29 in Bellingham. Topics include: LEAG report, GSRO report, 5th funding round (including funding level), small grant program, assessments for multiple LE's, and initial discussion of the 6th grant round.</p> <p>Rollie Geppert provided an update on the 5th funding round. The quality of Lead Entity strategies has been very good, as per the review panel observations. Some Lead Entities have really improved, but none had all excellent scores. All of the "Projects of Concern" have been reviewed multiple times – the total number of these projects is now 27. Rollie mentioned that Steve Leider has provided exceptional leadership to the Review Panel process. He also said that the panel has performed extremely well due, in part, to the involvement of 2 former agency regional directors. Rollie concluded by stating that the process for the 5th funding round appears to have been very smooth with few complaints registered. Paul Dorn was in agreement with Rollie's comments, stating that he greatly appreciated the efforts of IAC and WDFW.</p>
<p>SRFB 6th Funding Round</p>	<p>Jim Fox outlined some policy considerations for the 6th funding round. Should the process remain largely the same as the 5th round, with only minor tweaks? Or should the process be redesigned? Should the schedule be the same as the 5th round – begin in March 2005 and culminate with SRFB decisions in December 2005? What are the implications of the regional recovery plans? (Five will be completed by June 2005) How does LEAG want to be involved?</p> <p>Doug Osterman asked each person whether they favor major or minor changes to the current program. All agreed that the 5th round process (with minor tweaks) is preferred. John Sims strongly urged IAC to maintain the current schedule so that local sponsors do not lose interest in the process. Kim Bredensteiner echoed this concern. Paul Dorn urged the SRFB to keep the funding at a robust level in order to maintain the current momentum. All other members shared that view.</p> <p>Jeanette Dorner recommended the 6th round consider a unified approach for nearshore project prioritization. There was considerable discussion about whether the Shared Strategy or the Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project (PSNERP) process could provide the basis for achieving a prioritized list. Doug Osterman (LEAG's representative on PSNERP) was doubtful that PSNERP will have a prioritized list of projects in the near-term, particularly for the 6th funding cycle. Kim Bredensteiner wondered how this would affect Lead Entities (such as Island, San Juan and Thurston Counties) that only have a nearshore component. Steve Martin suggested that each</p>

	<p>salmon recovery region could be provided programmatic funds to prioritize projects that span multiple WRIA's. The needs across WRIA planning areas are greater than just Puget Sound, according to Steve.</p> <p>LEAG reached consensus that the SRFB should conduct a full-fledged 6th funding cycle with a robust funding level. The funding cycle should be conducted using only minor tweaks to the process used for the 5th Round.</p> <p>The rationale for this recommendation is to maintain: interest in the funding process; relationships with project sponsors; timely implementation of projects; and current momentum. It was also felt that the regional plans would have no significant bearing on the Lead Entity project lists, priorities, and strategies.</p> <p>Jim Fox asked LEAG how they would like to be involved in the design of the 6th round. Several ideas were floated, including a workshop, staff drafts for review, or a committee. Doug Osterman had contacted his buddy LE's (WRIAs 7 and 8) on this question and they recommended that LEAG play a major role in designing policy for the 6th funding cycle.</p> <p>LEAG reached consensus that it is to be directly involved with any program (schedule and policy) modifications for the 6th Funding Cycle.</p> <p>No decision was made on how to proceed (for example, will there be a workshop to develop policy; a committee formed to draft the policy; or will staff prepare drafts for review).</p>
<p>Watershed Enhancement</p>	<p>Marnie Tyler provided some background and clarification on the watershed enhancement concept that Bob Nichols presented at the last LEAG meeting. An issue paper will be provided to the new Governor at the time of the transition and there is the potential for new legislation, possible as soon as the coming session. Doug Osterman stated that the approach has important implications for the Lead Entity program – the purpose of today's discussion is to provide Bob Nichols with some useful comments. Jim Fox stated that the watershed enhancement work group will be meeting again on November 5, but that drafts of different pieces are under development in the interim. Bill Towey wanted to know about the process for discussing this with the managers. Nichols has met with NWIFC since the last LEAG meeting, but Jim Fox was not sure about additional meetings with CRITFC and UCUT. Steve Martin mentioned that he had talked some with 2 staff from CRITFC tribes. They expressed concern about the definitions of the terms "Board" and "WAC" that are being used.</p> <p>Group Discussion: Steve Martin had met with the Snake River Board to discuss the 8 questions posed by Bob Nichols in his issue paper (attached). Doug Osterman asked each LEAG member to provide their individual</p>

	<p>comments and summarize the comments they received from their “buddies” on the watershed enhancement issue paper. Kim Bredensteiner stated that she and her partner LE’s feel that the concept of paper is probably OK, but would like to make sure that estuaries and nearshore areas are included for funding. Kim also had questions about the Local Action Committees, such as who would administer them? Scott Jungblom stated that combining 2514 and 2496 may not produce cost savings and in fact may be adding complexity and duplicating efforts – he urged continued funding for implementing current plans. Scott recommended that the WAC’s authorize integration of processes, but participation be optional. This would maintain local control and avoid changing local processes where integration is occurring now. LEAG members in general expressed concern about possibly losing local control and urged that implementation be kept close to the local level. Several members thought that having one group do both watershed plan implementation and salmon recovery implementation may be too much and could not be sustained. Roy Huberd had concerns about watershed enhancement taking dollars away from salmon recovery. Making changes now, and potentially adding bureaucracy, may interfere with recovery plan implementation. He mentioned that Pierce County currently has four watershed councils that have been ongoing since as far back as 412 non-point plans. The proposed watershed enhancement concepts may not be a good fit for Pierce County and implementation of these well-established processes. John Sims advised going slow with this proposal – this legislative session is too soon. More time is needed to build consensus. John said that tribes need to be involved. He expressed major concern about the lack of funding for 2514 plan implementation, and that areas which don’t have 2514 planning should not be penalized. Doug Osterman consulted with his “LE buddies” and they echoed the concerns that John Sims raised. Regarding the issues about time, Doug agreed that there was not opportunity to raise this subject, for example, with his watershed Steering Committee in the next couple months. Doug agreed that it is important to involve the tribes and obtain their support. Jim Fox mentioned that the costs for watershed and salmon organizational infrastructure is perceived as a problem by some legislators – the risk of inaction is that the legislature may take action on their own in the absence of a executive branch proposal. Nonetheless, Bill Towey said that the lack of mention in the document of tribes is a red flag. The Colville Confederated Tribes want direct communication on this issue. Paul Nelson stated that integration could be positive provided that salmon dollars are managed for salmon. He stated that integration could bring about benefits, especially down the road 10 to 20 years, such as more consistent and stable funding, coordination on monitoring, and common watershed goals. It was suggested that the LEAG Chair share these comments in his report to the SRFB later this month.</p>
NEXT MEETING	Tentatively November 17 in Ellensburg